



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,598	07/02/2003	Jack L. Meador	10018099-1	4842

22879 7590 02/08/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, ALLEN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

02/08/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/612,598	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MEADOR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Allen H. Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,9,10,13,14 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15,19,20 and 31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,10,26 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6,9,13,14 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- This office action is responsive to the following communication:  
Amendment filed on 07/17/2007.
- Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 9-10, 13-14, 26-30 are currently pending in the application.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Claims 15, 19-20, 31 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 11/05/2007.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 3-4, 6, 9, 13-14 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
Claim 3, line 17, " the the at least" should be changed to - - the at least- -.  
Claims 4, 6, 9, 13-14 are objected as being dependent on claim 3.  
Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 07/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. With respect to applicant's argument that the Hasegawa Patent fails to anticipate Applicant's independent claim 1, and the combination of the Hasegawa Patent and the Whaley Publication fail to teach, suggest, or reasonably make obvious Applicant's independent claim 1.

In reply: It is noted that Hasegawa '191 does not explicitly show:  
shredding the printed document,

preventing reconstruction of the shredded printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Gary Stringham and Bert Newell (2001RD-447077). In particular, Research Disclosure Database Number (2001RD-447077) teaches:

shredding the printed document (The device sends the undesired pages to the shredder bin, page 1),

preventing reconstruction of the shredded printed document (Used for a printer that is a shredder, just like a normal office shredder used to shred confidential documents, page 1).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and then given the well-established teaching of Pub No. (2001RD-447077), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa as taught by Pub No. (RD-0447077) to include: shredding the printed document, and preventing reconstruction of the shredded printed document, since Gary Stringham and Bert Newell stated in the first paragraph that such a modification would be the ideal is to have an external paper handling output device

connected to a printer that is a shredder, just like the normal office shredder used to shred confidential documents.

5. With respect to applicant's argument that the Hasegawa Patent apparently discloses a much cruder tool that does not distinguish printing onto an existing text of a printed document from printing onto a whitespace portion of the same existing document.

In reply: the combination of Hasegawa '191 and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell does not explicitly show the method wherein the at least one target portion at which the at least one obfuscation pattern is printed comprises:

only at least one whitespace portion of the printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Taylor '849. In particular, Taylor '849 teaches the method wherein the at least one target portion at which the at least one obfuscation pattern is printed (i.e., a method encoding copies of a printed document to make the copies unreadable; see Abstract) comprises: only at least one whitespace portion of the printed document (i.e., white-colored areas is placed over an original document, and a copy made of the document; col. 2, lines 30-32).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell, and then given the well-established teaching of Taylor, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell as taught by

Taylor to include: the method wherein the at least one target portion at which the at least one obfuscation pattern is printed comprises: only at least one whitespace portion of the printed document, since Taylor stated in col. 1, lines 5-7, that such a modification would ensure a method for enhancing the confidentiality of printed or typed messages.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al. (US 5,666,191) in view of Gary Stringham and Bert Newell (2001RD-447077).

Regarding claim 1, Hasegawa '191 discloses a method of preventing comprehension of a printed document (i.e., an information concealing pattern over a surface of a sheet carrying printed information; see Abstract), the method comprising:

feeding a printed document into a device having a printing mechanism (i.e., each paper sheet P is fed into the information concealing printing unit 7; see col. 7, lines 45-50, fig. 1);

printing (103, fig. 14), via the printing mechanism (101, fig. 14), at least one obfuscation pattern (fig. 4) onto over at least a portion of the printed document to

prevent comprehension of the printed document (i.e., on printing the information concealing pattern over the surface of the sheet carrying the printed information, the printed information becomes unreadable; see Abstract);

It is noted that Hasegawa '191 does not explicitly show:

shredding the printed document,

preventing reconstruction of the shredded printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Gary Stringham and Bert Newell (2001RD-447077). In particular, Research Disclosure Database Number (2001RD-447077) teaches:

shredding the printed document (The device sends the undesired pages to the shredder bin, page 1),

preventing reconstruction of the shredded printed document (Used for a printer that is a shredder, just like a normal office shredder used to shred confidential documents, page 1).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and then given the well-established teaching of Pub No. (2001RD-447077), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa as taught by Pub No. (RD-0447077) to include: shredding the printed document, and preventing reconstruction of the shredded printed document, since Gary Stringham and Bert Newell stated in the first paragraph that such a modification would be the ideal is to have an external paper handling output device

connected to a printer that is a shredder, just like the normal office shredder used to shred confidential documents.

Regarding claim 30, Hasegawa '191 discloses the method, wherein the at least one obfuscation pattern comprises two or more different obfuscation patterns (i.e., patterns which are capable of rendering the character and other information printed on a sheet of paper or the like unreadable by being printed thereover, such as solid patterns, halftone patterns, fine geometric patterns, irregular dot patterns, irregular stripe patterns, characters or letters having a substantially same size as the characters, letters and symbols that are to be concealed and consisting of a large number of lines arranged at a dense character pitch and line spacing; see col. 16, lines 1-10).

8. Claims 3-4, 10, 26, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al. (US 5,666,191) in view of Gary Stringham and Bert Newell (2001RD-447077), and further in view of Taylor (US 5,184,849).

Regarding claim 3, Hasegawa '191 discloses the method and further comprising: scanning the printed document (images obtained by image scanning means, col. 3, lines 17-18) prior to printing the at least one obfuscation pattern (fig. 4) onto the printed document to produce at least one of an image file (i.e., the paper sheet are printed with image concealing patterns over the information already printed on the paper sheet; col. 7, lines 49-51);



identifying, based upon the at least one image file or electronic text file, at least one target portion of the printed document at which the at least one obfuscation pattern is printed (i.e., it is also possible to automatically distinguish and recognize the kind of letters and image patterns used in the paper sheet for expressing the information with a pattern recognition unit 105 according to the data obtained by the information reading unit 5, and to select an information concealing pattern with an information concealing pattern generating unit 106 from a font storage unit 120 according to the result of the distinguishing and recognition process by the pattern recognition unit 105 so that an optimum information concealing pattern may be selected according to the kind of letters expressing the information, the line pitch and the character pitch, and may be supplied to the printer 108; see col. 12, lines 60-67 and col. 13, lines 1-5, fig. 13);

Hasegawa '191 does not explicitly show scanning the printed document prior to printing the at least one obfuscation pattern onto an electronic text file of the printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Taylor '849. In particular, Taylor '849 teaches scanning the printed document prior to printing the at least one obfuscation pattern onto an electronic text file of the printed document (i.e., the text of message section 25 of document 23 is rendered unreadable by the superposition of mask 20; see col. 4, lines 33-35, figs. 5, 7).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and then given the well-established teaching of Taylor, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa as

taught by Taylor to include: scanning the printed document prior to printing the at least one obfuscation pattern onto an electronic text file of the printed document, since Taylor stated in col. 1, lines 5-7, that such a modification would ensure a method for enhancing the confidentiality of printed or typed messages.

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Hasegawa '191 and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell does not explicitly show the method wherein the at least one target portion at which the at least one obfuscation pattern is printed comprises:

only at least one whitespace portion of the printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Taylor '849. In particular, Taylor '849 teaches the method wherein the at least one target portion at which the at least one obfuscation pattern is printed (i.e., a method encoding copies of a printed document to make the copies unreadable; see Abstract) comprises: only at least one whitespace portion of the printed document (i.e., white-colored areas is placed over an original document, and a copy made of the document; col. 2, lines 30-32).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell, and then given the well-established teaching of Taylor, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell as taught by Taylor to include: the method wherein the at least one target portion at which the at least one obfuscation pattern is printed comprises: only at least one whitespace portion

of the printed document, since Taylor stated in col. 1, lines 5-7, that such a modification would ensure a method for enhancing the confidentiality of printed or typed messages.

Regarding claim 10, Hasegawa '191 discloses the method, comprising printing the at least one obfuscation pattern as at least one of:

a random pattern of individual pixels (irregular dot patterns, col. 16, lines 4-5 );  
a random pattern of pixel clusters with each pixel cluster having at least one of a randomly selected shape (i.e., irregular stripe patters, characters, letters and having a substantially same size as the characters, letters and symbols that are to be concealed; see col. 16, lines 5-7), a randomly selected intensity (i.e., consisting of a large number of lines arranged at a dense character pitch; see col. 16, lines 7-9), a randomly selected size (i.e., an irregular pattern, an irregular stripe pattern or characters or letters including a large number of lines, and of a size similar to the letter or the symbol to be concealed; see col. 5, lines 1-3), a randomly selected location on the printed document (i.e., the information concealing pattern may be changed randomly and electronically for each day or each time a new file is created by using a random number generator, and the analysis of the concealed information based on the knowledge of the information concealing pattern can be made difficult; see col. 13, lines 5-10), including driving the random pattern with at least one of a linear geometric function (a fine geometric pattern, col.16, line 4), a non-linear geometric function (irregular stripe patters, col. 16, line 5), a repeating function, and a non-repeating function.

The combination of Hasegawa '191 and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell (2001RD-447077) does not explicitly show a random selected color.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Taylor '849. In particular, Taylor '849 teaches a random selected color (i.e., opaque regions are of a color which is invisible to a photocopying machine of the type which the mask is intended to be used with; see col. 2, lines 30-32).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell, and then given the well-established teaching of Taylor, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell as taught by Taylor to include: a random selected color, since Taylor stated in col. 1, lines 5-7, that such a modification would ensure a method for enhancing the confidentiality of printed or typed messages.

Regarding claim 26, Hasegawa '191 discloses a computer readable medium (37, fig. 2) having computer-executable instructions (31, fig. 2) for performing a method of obfuscating a printed document (i.e., on printing the information concealing pattern over the surface of the sheet carrying the printed information, the printed information becomes unreadable; see Abstract), the method comprising:

manipulating at least one of a symbol pattern (i.e., in fig. 4 is an actual example of result of printing an information concealing pattern over an information carrying surface of a paper sheet), a character pattern (for concealing the information expressed

by the characters, col. 4, lines 65-66), a word pattern (letters, col. 4, line 66), a random pixel pattern (irregular dot patterns, col. 16, lines 4-5 ).

Hasegawa '191 does not disclose shredding of the over-printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Gary Stringham and Bert Newell (2001RD-447077). In particular, Research Disclosure Database (2001RD-447077) teaches shredding of the over-printed document (The device sends the undesired pages to the shredder bin, page 1).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and then given the well-established teaching of Pub No. (2001RD-447077), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa as taught by Pub No. (RD-0447077) to include: shredding of the over-printed document, since Gary Stringham and Bert Newell stated in the first paragraph that such a modification would be the ideal is to have an external paper handling output device connected to a printer that is a shredder, just like the normal office shredder used to shred confidential documents.

The combination of Hasegawa '191 and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell does not explicitly show identifying at least one whitespace portion, at least one text portion, and at least one graphics portion of a printed document; and an image pattern configured for over-printing onto the respective whitespace portion, the text portion, and the graphics portion of the printed document to prevent reconstruction of the over-printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Taylor '849. In particular, Taylor '849 teaches identifying at least one whitespace portion (i.e., white-colored areas placed over the document prior to making a first photocopy of the document; see Abstract), at least one text portion (i.e., the text of message section 25 of document 23 is rendered unreadable by the superposition of mask 20; see col. 4, lines 33-35, figs. 5, 7), and at least one graphics portion of a printed document (i.e., a standard cross hair or bullseye pattern, of the type commonly used in various graphics arts fields, could be placed at diagonally opposed corners of mask 20; see col. 5, lines 20-22, figs. 5-6); and an image pattern configured for over-printing onto the respective whitespace portion (i.e., white-colored areas is placed over an original document, and a copy made of the document; see col. 2, lines 30-31), a the text portion (i.e., the size of the opaque areas, and the spacing or period interval between the areas, are of the proper dimensions to make text contained in the original document unreadable in the photocopy made of the masked original; see col. 2, lines 32-35), and the graphics portion (in various graphics arts fields, col. 5, line 21) of the printed document to prevent reconstruction of the over-printed document (i.e., a method and article for optically encoding copies of a printed document to make the copies unreadable).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell, and then given the well-established teaching of Taylor, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell as taught by

Taylor to include: identifying at least one whitespace portion, at least one text portion, and at least one graphics portion of a printed document; and an image pattern configured for over-printing onto the respective whitespace portion, the text portion, and the graphics portion of the printed document to prevent reconstruction of the over-printed document, since Taylor stated in col. 1, lines 5-7, that such a modification would ensure a method for enhancing the confidentiality of printed or typed messages.

Regarding claim 28, the combination of Hasegawa '191 and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell does not disclose the method, wherein printing the at least one obfuscation pattern comprises printing the at least one obfuscation pattern over at least one graphics portion of the printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Taylor '849. In particular, Taylor '849 teaches the method, wherein printing the at least one obfuscation pattern comprises printing the at least one obfuscation pattern over at least one graphics portion of the printed document (i.e., the type commonly used in various graphics arts fields, could be placed at diagonally opposed corners of mask 20; see col. 5, lines 20-22, figs. 5-6).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell, and then given the well-established teaching of Taylor, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell as taught by Taylor to include: the method, wherein printing the at least one obfuscation pattern

comprises printing the at least one obfuscation pattern over at least one graphics portion of the printed document, since Taylor stated in col. 1, lines 5-7, that such a modification would ensure a method for enhancing the confidentiality of printed or typed messages.

9. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al. (US 5,666,191) in view of Gary Stringham and Bert Newell (2001RD-447077), and further in view of Regan (US 4,786,941).

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Hasegawa '191 and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell does not explicitly show the method, wherein printing the obfuscation pattern comprises printing at least one character that complementarily obscures an identified character of the printed document and printing the at least one character as an overstrike onto the identified character of the printed document.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Regan '941. In particular, Regan '941 teaches the method, wherein printing the obfuscation pattern comprises printing at least one character that complementarily obscures an identified character of the printed document and printing the at least one character as an overstrike onto the identified character of the printed document (i.e., two or more copies of a document are made with complementary portions missing for separate secure transporting or storing. The copies may be made



on an electrostatic copies having an image erase feature or on a printer which can impress an erase signal on the printing signal; see Abstract, figs. 2A-2C).

In view of the above, having the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell, and then given the well-established teaching of Regan, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hasegawa and Gary Stringham and Bert Newell as taught by Regan to include: the method, wherein printing the obfuscation pattern comprises printing at least one character that complementarily obscures an identified character of the printed document and printing the at least one character as an overstrike onto the identified character of the printed document, since Regan stated in col. 1, lines 5-10, that such a modification would ensure a method of protecting confidential documents.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 6, 9, 13-14, 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 6, the prior art of the record fails to show or fairly suggest the method, wherein identifying the at least one target portion of the printed document comprises: the first pattern of symbols including a line spacing, a paragraph spacing,

and a margin spacing of the printed document, wherein the symbols of the first pattern include at least one of characters or numerals.

Regarding claim 9, the prior art of the record fails to show or fairly suggest the method, wherein the at least one target portion of the printed document comprises a white space portion of the printed document and printing the at least one obfuscation pattern at the at least one target portion comprises at least one of: produce a substantially uniform thickness of ink or toner for the combination of the at least one identified character and the negative image of the at least one identified character on the printed document, wherein the whitespace portion comprises an area surrounding the at least one identified character and defined by the printed negative image of the identified character;

randomly selecting characters and printing strings of the selected characters at randomly selected angles on the printed document;

randomly selecting characters and printing the selected characters individually at angles rotated relative to existing characters of the printed document.

Regarding claim 13, the prior art of the record fails to show or fairly suggest the method, comprising: randomly selecting a plurality of content-free words and printing the selected words in a non-grammatical order as the at least one obfuscation pattern in the at least one whitespace portion of the printed document with the selected words printed in at least one of a repeating pattern and a non-repeating pattern.

Regarding claim 14, the prior art of the record fails to show or fairly suggest the method, wherein identifying the at least one target portion comprises: a rotated image of the at least one graphic portion, a negative image of the at least one graphic portion, and a scrambled image of the at least one graphic portion.

Regarding claim 27, the prior art of the record fails to show or fairly suggest the medium, wherein: manipulating the word pattern includes obfuscating natural language word groupings of the text portion of the printed document.

### ***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Silverschotz et al. (US 5,542,710) discloses recyclable instant scratch off lottery ticket.

Allen et al. (US 4,980,719) discloses copier/printer and method for reproduction of secure documents or the like.

Kortenoeven et al. (US 2005/0154582) discloses erasing a stored information pattern on a storage medium.

Mayer, Jr. et al. (US 3,781,109) discloses data encoding and decoding apparatus and method.

Stangenberg et al. (US 5,538,194) discloses document shredder.

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-270-1229. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571)-272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/612,598  
Art Unit: 2625

Page 20

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



KING Y. POON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AN

02/01/2008